DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 729 HE 008 791

AUTHOR	Linnell, Robert H.; Marsh, Herbert W.
TITLE	Ethical and Economic Issues. An Interview Survey at Ten Universities.
INSTITUTION	University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Office of Institutional Studies.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	21 Jan 77
NOTE	26p.; Presented at the Annual Academic Planning Conference (2nd, University of Southern California Office of Institutional Studies, Los Angeles, California, January 19-21, 1977)
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of Institutional Studies, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90007 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Freedom; *Administrative Policy; *College Faculty; Consultants; Copyrights; Economic Factors; *Ethical Values; Faculty Workload; Fringe Benefits; Higher Education; *Income; Interviews; Job Enrichment; Part Time Jobs; Personal Values; Professional Continuing Education; Sabbatical Leaves; *Salaries

ABSTRACT

As part of a project concerning policies for those activities that university administrators, faculty, or professional staff may engage in for additional income above their normal full-time salaries, this study's objectives were to determine (1) what policies existed and (2) the extent to which policies or lack of them were considered satisfactory. A one-hour structured interview was designed, tested, and used with 30 faculty and administrators at 10 different universities. Twenty-five interviews were sufficiently complete to use in the analysis. The interview items, all relating to income above basic contract salary (economic issues) and potential loss of academic freedom or conflict-of-interest (ethical issues) included: (1) load and overload (including consulting), (2) property rights for inventions and educational material, (3) salaries for sabbatical leaves and time spent on sponsored projects, (4) continuing education, (5) fringe benefits, and (6) codes relating to ethical behavior and conflict-of-interest. Since this study is complex and involves a limited number of institutions and individuals, no final conclusions can be made, but the results suggest major problem areas and some directions for further work. (LBH)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED136729

ETHICAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES

AN INTERVIEW SURVEY

AT

TEN UNIVERSITIES

by

Robert H. Linnell
Herbert W. Marsh

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 008 791

Presented at Second Annual Academic Planning Conference
January 19, 20, 21. 1977, University of Southern California
Office of Institutional Studies, Los Angeles, California 90007

"Ethical and Economic Issues - University Policies for Consulting, Overload Instructional Activities and Intellectual Property".

Support of the Carnegie Corporation of New York is gratefully acknowledged.

Ethical and Economic Issues

AN INTERVIEW SURVEY AT TEN UNIVERSITIES

by
Robert H. Linnell
Herbert W. Marsh
Office of Institutional Studies, University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

INTRODUCTION

This study is part of a project concerning policies for those activities which university administrators, faculty or professional staff may engage in for additional income above their normal full-time salary. A major objective was to find out what policies existed and secondly the extent to which current policies (or lack of them) were considered satisfactory. It was also hoped that some successful policies might be found useful as models for other institutions.

A one-hour structured interview was designed, tested and used with faculty and administrators at ten different universities. It was difficult to develop a satisfactory structured interview because of the complexity of the policy issues and institutional differences. Furthermore it was found that generally no one individual at a given university was sufficiently familar with all these policy areas so as to be able to answer all the interview questions.

The interview technique provided a personal interaction and impressions about policy problems and concerns which are difficult to separate from the structured interview answers. Valuable insights may be developed from this technique but the objectivity of the analysis is difficult to maintain. Therefore, the comments and conclusions in this report must be considered within this background. It should also be pointed out that in a structured interview an answer may be "forced" into one of the structured items but comments can then be made which indicate different meanings to the answer.

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Steve Kesler for his valuable assistance.

Although the original intent was to review policy for all three groups, administrators, faculty and professional staff, it was found that there are differences (which are not very clear in most cases). Many administrators also are faculty and some professional staff do teaching. When there were questions regarding different policies for these three groups, the study focused on faculty. In the analysis, no separation of the responses from faculty or administrators was made because of the small number of respondees.

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Interviews were conducted with thirty faculty and administrators, at ten universities, of which twenty-five were sufficiently complete to use in the analysis. The interview items, all relating to income above basic contract salary (economic issues) and potential loss of academic freedom or conflict-of-interest (ethical issues) were as follows: 1) load and overload (including consulting), 2) property rights for inventions and educational material, 3) salaries for sabbatical leaves and for time spent on sponsored projects, 4) continuing education, 5) fringe benefits on overload salary and 6) codes relating to ethical behavior and conflict-of-interest. This is a very complex set of policy and practice areas and the number of institutions and people interviewed is very limited; hence, no final conclusions can be made from the results. The results are of interest in suggesting major problem areas and some directions and ideas for further work. Summary comments are as follows:

- Every interviewee at all institutions surveyed identified one or more of the study areas as being of current interest and concern.

- Policies and practices for "internal" (i.e. within the institution) activities for which additional (i.e. above base) salary is paid are frequently ad hoc, fragmentary, incomplete, unclear or nonexistent. None of the institutions seem to have a clear definition of load and most seem to feel that load cannot (or should not) be defined; this creates a great dilemma in setting policy for overload. There is considerable variation in load practice amongst institutions and among schools, colleges and departments with a single, large

university. Policies for summer teaching and research are usually more clearly defined but clarification of simultaneous research and teaching during the same summer and relationship to "external" (i.e. consulting and other outside the institution activities) are lacking at most of the institutions. Maximum time (and salary) for internal summer activities is usually limited to either two months, two and one-half months or three months (the reasons for these different limits are not clear).

- Policies and practices for "external" (i.e. outside the institution) activities for additional salary (e.g. consulting, teaching for another organization, working as employee) involve the maximum amount of time which can be spent on these activities (frequently one day per week), usually a general statement that outside work should not interfere with the primary institutional work and a statement regarding professional behavior. One or more aspects of current policy or practice for external activities was reported to be unsatisfactory at every institution. Problem areas include maximum time spent on consulting (does one day a week mean one in seven or in six or five; how do "vacations" at Christmas and and Spring recess count; how many consecutive days may be taken, do you count service or government advisory panels or professional association committees, etc.). Conflict-of-interest, real or apparent, is an emerging area of concern, largely not covered in current policy. The relationship of internal and external "overload" activity and maximum time limits on each separately or together, has not been considered in policy except at one of the ten institutions.

- Property rights involved in the use of educational materials are becoming increasingly important. Textbooks are generally the sole property of the authors, unless produced by special funding (e.g. government). Author use of textbooks in their own classes is not covered by policy in most cases. The rapidly evolving newer technologies such as TV tapes, computers and other audio-visual educational combinations are either not under present policy or covered by ad hoc policies which may not adequately consider a variety of internal and external uses. The need for policy for computer software use may be the most urgent. Faculty production of education material for external organizations (e.g. commercial firm or professional association) usually are not included in any policy.

- Policies for patenting and developing university inventions have been evolving for many years. Royalty sharing agreements (inventor-institution) are widespread. Patent policy does not seem to be a major problem area except for the differing policies of federal funding agencies.

- Current policies on load, overload, external activities (i.e. especially teaching at other institutions), and property rights for educational materials, present serious problems to the development of high quality, reasonable cost continuing education/extension programs, through the university.

- Reimbursement to the university for faculty time spent on sponsored research is reflected in diverse policies which have evolved over the

last quarter century. Variations of from 0 to 100% of academic year faculty time spent on sponsored projects may be charged, sometimes at the option of an individual faculty member or because of departmental or school policy. Some rationalization of current policies and practices appears to be needed.

- At the institutions studied, paid sabbatical leaves do not appear to present policy problems. A no-loss, no-gain in total salary, for approved sabbaticals, is a popular policy.

- Fringe benefits (particularly retirement benefits) are frequently paid on summer salaries but not on other types of salary above academic year base (e.g. overload teaching).

- Conflict-of-interest and the potential or appearance of conflict-of-interest needs attention in view of the changing nature of our current society. Most institutional policy in this area is too general and diffuse and was developed before the era of consumerism, accountability and the specialized interests of a complex industrial society.

Although there is considerable reluctance to proliferate new administrative policy or practice which might become rigid and counter productive, this preliminary survey indicates pressing needs to review all academic policy for its economic and ethical impact on faculty, academic institutions and the general public. Policy review and revision for the protection of academic freedom from external economic pressures and from federal restrictions brought about by current policy inadequacies, is particularly urgent. Clear policies could protect academic freedom and the integrity of academics as well as improve the public image of the university.

UNIVERSITY INTERVIEWS

Method. A series of structured interviews were held at ten universities. When scheduling was possible, interviews were arranged with both faculty and administrators. Faculty were selected on the basis of their leadership roles at their institution (e.g. Chairman of Research Committee, of Faculty Senate, of Patent Committee, of Consulting Committee, etc.) and administrators were academic leaders (e.g. Provost, Vice President for Academic Affairs, etc.) and Sponsored Research Directors. The institutions were selected partly on the basis of scheduling convenience and do not represent a random sample. However, the results are believed to be useful in shedding light on the problem areas as well as suggesting additional work and possible paths for new policies. The interviews covered eight major topics: 1) Load and Overload; 2) Production and Use of Educational Materials; 3) Inventions, Patents and Resulting Property Rights; 4) Continuing Education/ Extension Programs; 5) Salary Reimbursement for Time Spent on Externally Funded Projects; 6) Paid Sabbatical Leaves; 7) Fringe Benefits on Overload (including summer); and 8) Conflict of Interest. One hour was allocated to each interview and documentation (faculty handbook and other policy materials) was collected. Interviewees were given an opportunity to express their personal opinions.

Results. All interviewees were very cooperative and open. Many expressed considerable interest in the project and requested that the results be sent to them. Almost all the administrators indicated that they felt one or more of the topics was a serious problem area for them.

Only one faculty member indicated any negative reaction by pressing the interviewer as to why the project was being conducted and what would be done with the results. Because health sciences areas generally have different policies, they were excluded from the study. It appeared generally that professional staff were under different policies than faculty so the study was focused on faculty policies and practices. It was also found that some policies or practices were determined by departments or schools and therefore varied within an institution. Finally, in many cases the interviewees did not know their institution's policy and in a number of instances even when they thought they knew, the information turned out to be incorrect. A summary of the results follows:

1. Faculty Load and Overload*. Most faculty at nine of the institutions are on academic year contracts whereas at the tenth institution the faculty are on a fiscal (12 month) contract. Only one of the institutions has an official teaching load policy and at the other institutions the loads are determined by and vary amongst the departmental/school/divisional units.

Overload salary may be paid to a faculty member for academic year teaching in the faculties' own academic department in only two of the institutions (and in one of these it was stated that it was unusual). Overload salary for academic year teaching in continuing education/extension is generally permitted at eight of the ten institutions. The nine institutions whose faculty are largely on academic year contracts are permitted additional salary for research and teaching during the summer. Additional academic year salary may be paid by the institution for internal consulting at five of the institutions and for curriculum development, at three; in both cases,

*For convenience we defined overload to be all activities for which additional salary, above base salary, may be paid. Since most faculty at nine of the institutions are on academic year contracts, this definition of overload will include the entire summer as well as part-time activity during the academic year.

however, such payments are not made often. In four institutions, additional academic year salary may be paid for administrative positions. Many institutions seem to prefer to give released time for overload work rather than additional salary. When permitted, overload work for which additional salary is paid during the academic year may be performed at any time including weekends, evenings and in at least four institutions, during the regular staff working hours of the university. When academic year overload salary is permitted, it may be limited as a percentage of academic year salary (in six institutions the limits ranged from 5-25%) or in terms of time commitment (measured by days per week or courses taught).

Summer research salary is limited to 2/9 academic year salary (one institution), 2.5/9 academic year salary (four institutions) or 3.0/9 academic year salary (four institutions). Limitations on total number of summer courses taught are typical at institutions with summer teaching. One institution has a detailed policy which limits the combined salary/time for summer research and teaching when a faculty member does both activities in the same summer.

External consulting, teaching at another institution or other activities may be performed, generally without limit, during the summer months, by faculty on academic year contract (who are not paid additional for summer research or teaching). During the academic year, these external activities may be performed weekends, evenings or during the regular staff working hours of the university, at all ten institutions in our study; however, in all these institutions it is either explicit in a faculty handbook or the general understanding that such outside work must not interfere with the faculty member's responsibility to the institution. None of the ten institutions have any limitations on the amount of money which can be earned from

external activities and three have no explicit limitation on the time that may be spent. A maximum of one day per week of consulting (or an equivalent limitation in days per quarter, semester or academic year) is the most prevalent policy. Definition of what is vacation time during the academic year, clarification of consulting during the normal two-day weekend and whether a four-day work-week is permitted, have muddied the waters. Additional problem areas involve limitations on absences from classes or the maximun permitted total number of continuous days away from campus. Another question is whether government consulting (especially on advisory panels) is to be counted against the maximum number of consulting days allowed. These are current questions on many campuses. In addition to the lack of clarity regarding academic year consulting policy, there are unanswered questions about summer consulting (and other external activities) for those faculty who are on academic year contract and also doing summer research (in particular if paid by federal funds) and/or teaching for additional salary.

Information was requested on any specific policies relating to each one of the three major external activities, namely 1) teaching for another institution, 2) consulting or working for industry and 3) consulting or working for government. The survey tried to identify codes of behavior or conflict-of-interest policies. Specific policies for particular types of external work apparently have generally not been developed at any of our ten study institutions. The interview results were somewhat ambiguous: for example, in regard to teaching at other institutions, at two of the institutions, one interviewee believed there was a policy whereas another interviewee stated the opposite. The same ambiguity was found in regard to both industrial and government consulting, in each case at two institutions (not the same). In one state supported institution, teaching at another institution is permissible only at another institution within the same state-wide system.

Specific policy or practice regarding possible conflict-of-interest such as giving expert testimony which might relate to an industrial consulting position, etc., was sought. Three of our ten institutions stated clearly they had no such specific policy; four more don't have specific policy but the interviewees felt no such policy was needed as it was covered under much more general policy statements. At the other three institutions the several interviewees at each institution didn't agree with each other. However there were several policies unique to a particular institution such as a prohibition against serving on the board of or being an officer of a company which does business with the institution. At three of the study institutions a formal approval process is required prior to engaging in outside professional services. The monitoring of internal (i.e. for the institution) overload is generally done by administrative record keeping, in one institution by a required (detailed) faculty activity analysis and in another by an annual faculty report.
In regard to external teaching/consulting/working, the three institutions with a formal prior approval process have that record, and in one case the faculty activity analysis, which serve as reports; in all others the monitoring rests on informal department or school level processes and annual reporting or evaluations.

At only one institution in the study group was there a clear policy that internal and external overload/consulting were to be considered as combined (i.e. the maximum time commitment to above load activities would include both internal and external activities combined); at the other institutions, the internal and external above-load activities are independent or no clear policy exists.

Finally, a series of questions were asked about problems with current load/overload policies. There were 25 respondents at the ten institutions, but not all respondents answered all the items. The results are shown in the table.

Satisfaction with Current Load-Overload Policies
Numbers are Responses

	Definitely Yes	Generally Yes	Generally No	Definitely No
Satisfaction with Current Policies	5	10	3	5
Current Policies Are Followed	5	15	3	1
Policies Are Monitored/Enforced	4	7	8	3
Do Faculty Know Policies	10	10	3	1
Faculty Satisfaction with Policy	0	20	4	0

At least one respondent from each of four different institutions stated that current policy was generally or definitely unsatisfactory; four other institutions had one or more respondent who stated that current policies were only generally satisfactory (not definitely satisfactory). Almost all respondents had suggestions for improved policy. They included the following: clearer policy (4); policy to encourage grant/contract support (2); better records on external activities; better conflict-of-interest policy; better definitions of load and overload; avoid too rigid policies; protect public image of the institution; study possibility of permitting

staff to consult (like faculty); define limits; have full-disclosure; more reliance on good faith rather than records; need better monitoring; leave the faculty alone; current policy too liberal; policies should be self administered; new policies are currently being developed.

This preliminary survey on load and overload (internal and external) indicates a wide variety of policies and practices (or lack of them) and reflects some current uneasiness. There would appear to be a widespread need for change and/or major reform, but little agreement on what that reform should be.

2. Production and Use of Educational Materials. At all ten institutions textbooks written by faculty are the sole property of the authors. There are no specific policy limitations on faculty use of their own texts in their classes, except at one institution there is a policy requiring committee review of faculty texts in mimeographed form, prior to classroom use. On a voluntary basis, some faculty in the ten institutions, make a gift to the university (e.g. to a scholarship fund, etc.) of royalties earned on sale of their texts to their students at the institution. Three respondents (at three different institutions) felt that their institution had policies relating to use of university facilities or of use of university paid time (e.g. a secretary, themselves) in the production of educational material - this policy area is sometimes included in that for inventions or patents (or consulting work) or may only apply to those involved in a media center and not university-wide. The general understanding appears to be that use of office and library is permissible but university facilities (or staff) should generally not be used for personal economic gain. When educational material (excluding textbooks) is produced using university facilities and/or staff support, five of the institutions do have some policy about property rights,

at least for some types of these situations. The picture is rather unclear but in some cases faculty own the property, in others the university does and royalties may be shared, etc. The policy may treat use of educational material within the university differently than external use (especially if an external fee is paid). When educational material is produced with government support, the supporting agency may determine the policy. Only one of the ten institutions has a policy regarding faculty participation in producing educational materials for an external organization (e.g. a professional association, a commercial firm, another educational institution). When asked to evaluate their policies (or lack of them) in this area, of 15 responses, none stated the current policy was definitely satisfactory, 10 stated it was generally satisfactory and five generally or definitely unsatisfactory. There were many suggestions for policy change, most urgent was the stated need for a clear policy. Specific areas were as follows: need policy on non-textbook materials; need policies on video-tapes; need policy to encourage faculty to contribute royalties to the university. These preliminary survey results indicate an urgent need for new policy development in the area of education materials.

3. Inventions, Patents and Resulting Property Rights. All of the ten institutions have some type of patent policy including use of university facilities and university salaried personnel. Generally the institution will own the patent when university facilities/salaries were used in its development (but some policies permit faculty ownership in some cases). Royalties are shared between the university and the inventor at all ten institutions in the study. Sharing formulas vary a good deal. At one institution, the university deducts 15% service charge, then gives the first $5,000, 100% to the inventor; 50% of the next $15,000 and 30% of all

over $20,000 to the inventor. Another institution gives the inventor 15% of all royalties and the other 85% goes to the institution. Still another institution gives the inventor 35% of the first $50,000 gross royalties, 25% of the next $50,000 and 15% of all above $100,000. Several of the institutions may encourage the inventor in specific cases to pursue patenting and commercial introduction without assistance from the university. In seven of the ten institutions there is some active institutional encouragement to patent inventions. Sometimes questions arise about inventions and patents developed by faculty for external agencies (e.g. through consulting agreements) and the relationship to university work; specific policies to deal with this type of situation have been developed only at one institution and by implication at two others. Of the 14 responses regarding the adequacy of current patent policy, five were that current policy is definitely satisfactory, six felt current policy was generally satisfactory and three thought current policy was generally unsatisfactory. Five respondents suggested that although changes in patent policy were needed they should be made later. Specific suggestions were to encourage patent applications and to clarify policy. The impression is that patent policy at these ten institutions is not currently perceived as a major problem.

4. Continuing Education/Extention Programs. A series of questions was asked about policies regarding faculty in continuing education/extension programs. At one institution all such programs are taught by regular faculty with an academic departmental appointment; at one other institution all instruction in these programs is done by outside (i.e. non-institutional) instructors. At the other eight institutions a combination of institutional

faculty and outsiders serve as instructors. At the one institution where all instruction is by regular faculty, this teaching is part of the base teaching load and no overload payments are made. At one other institution payment for teaching continuing education/extension may be either on load (i.e. no extra compensation) or overload. Generally, however, such teaching is overload. At only one institution may tenure now be earned by faculty teaching exclusively in the continuing education division; it is a new policy and no tenure has yet been awarded. The overload salary rates are usually less than the rates paid regular academic faculty even after taking into account fewer office hours, research and administrative functions. The policies regarding involvement of regular faculty in continuing education were believed to be definitely satisfactory by only one respondent (out of 15), generally satisfactory by seven, generally unsatisfactory by five, and definitely unsatisfactory by two. Recommended changes were as follows: increase use of departmental faculty (5 respondents), need to define load (2), official recognition of continuing education work (1), and more financial support (1).

5. Salary Reimbursement for Time Spent on Externally Funded Projects. Policy on salary reimbursement for time spent on externally funded projects varies by academic unit at some institutions. Excluding the one institution with faculty on fiscal year (12 month) contracts we separate the policies into academic year and summer. At all nine institutions 100% of faculty summer salary may be charged to externally funded grants and contracts, within institutional and grantee policy. Academic year policy at five institutions required (with some exceptions) support for academic year faculty time spent on externally sponsored projects. At the remaining institutions, there is departmental or school autonomy; some units (e.g. engineering) generally

request payment for academic year faculty time on sponsored projects whereas others (e.g. chemistry) are generally opposed to academic year faculty salary support from grant or contract funds. Respondents were about evenly divided amongst those that request 100% reimbursement for actual academic year faculty time spent and those that request less than full reimbursement. When faculty salaries on a university budget are released because of grant or contract funding, the additional funds are used for a variety of purposes such as faculty replacement (14 responses), university general funds (12 responses), academic unit general funds (10 responses). Some institutions have formulae for sharing these funds. At all institutions there was flexibility to "bend" salary policy to fit specific funding source requirements. There were 22 responses regarding how satisfactory current policies are. They were as follows: (5) definitely satisfactory; (11) generally satisfactory; (2) generally unsatisfactory; (4) definitely unsatisfactory. Suggested change included 1) stricter policy for reimbursement to the university; 2) need to pay faculty overload; 3) need for faculty released time to do research; 4) departmental incentives needed; 5) should not discourage teaching. Generally, administrators felt that actual faculty academic year time spent on sponsored projects should be paid for whereas faculty can see only disadvantage to them to charge any part of academic year salary to a sponsored project. At all of the survey institutions research is considered a significant component of faculty load, but it is not always clear whether sponsored research should or can be done within this normal load time or requires a reduction in normal teaching load. Some institutions charge for faculty time spent on sponsored projects only if it requires a reduction in normal teaching load; others charge for faculty time spent on sponsored research including normal load research time even if there is not a reduction in teaching load. Because project money is considered "soft", there appear to be special attitudes toward its use, especially in payment of academic year salaries.

6. Paid Sabbatical Leaves. All 18 respondents to a question about requirements for paid sabbatical leave stated that an approved plan was required prior to approval of the leave. The policies in regard to accepting other paid employment or use of grant/contract funding during a paid sabbatical vary. The appropriateness of the paid employment is an important criteria. A no-loss, no-gain policy for total salary is usual but one institution will permit total earnings greater than normal salary, provided the additional salary can be shown to equal additional expenses due to the sabbatical. All the institutions responded that their paid sabbatical leave policies were either definitely or generally satisfactory. One faculty and one administrative respondent (at the same institution) felt the paid sabbatical policies should be made less restrictive. Two other administrators (at two different institutions) were interested in finding additional outside sources for the support of sabbatical funding. One administrator felt that more formal sabbatical rules were needed. Generally, policy problems regarding paid sabbaticals and additional income or conflict of interest do not appear to be important issues at this time.

7. Fringe Benefits on Overload (Including Summer). A large number of faculty do receive significant income above their academic year base, from both their own institution and from external sources such as consulting and teaching at other institutions. It therefore appeared of some interest to find out to what extent retirement and other salary-based benefits (insurance, etc.) was based only on academic year base salary and to what extent overload payments included these benefits. ERISSA (Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974) does specify that employees who are 50% time or more must be given the opportunity to

participate in an institutions' retirement plan but our interest is primarily with the full-time people who are, in addition, working "part-time" "overload". One other point is relevant; the federal government requires uniformity in accounting policy in dealing with grant or contract funds. Thus, if an institution provides retirement, insurance and other fringe benefits on summer salaries paid from federal grant/contract funds then the institution must do the same with its own funds paid for summer teaching or other work.

In this ten institution study we found only two institutions that did not provide retirement and other fringe benefits on summer salary. However, other overload payments (e.g. continuing education/extension) and internal consulting do not provide retirement or insurance benefits at any of the institutions in the survey. During the course of this preliminary survey we have learned of other institutions that do not provide retirement or other fringe benefits on summer salary. A more comprehensive survey is needed.

Fringe benefits on "overload" salary payments was not considered an important issue at any of the ten institutions. Only one respondent expressed dissatisfaction in this question. The continuing education and summer school people are most interested. Obviously, any policy changes which would move overload to load activity would automatically provide fringe benefits to total load salary; this could be a benefit of considerable importance in those cases where overload payments were large and the new on-load salary represented a significant increase.

8. Conflict-of-Interest. In all interviews there was a final unstructured general question regarding codes of ethics and/or conflict-of-interest policies. Interviewees were asked if there were existing institutional, school or departmental codes of ethics or policy statements on

conflict-of-interest or similar published material. Additional questions in the ensuing discussion related to problem areas and information covering any specific cases. The answers are too varied for specific analysis, but some comments can be made. Generally faculty handbooks or other school/institutional policy guides have statements on this subject. These statements imply faculty commitment to their descipline and their institution and general behavior consistent with their responsibilities and may be summarized in the words of one interviewee, "freedom equals responsibility". Most (but not all) of the ten institutions has one or more additional specific policies, such as the following:

A) University officers are not permitted to be on boards of companies with which the university does business (a modification of this policy restricts faculty purchases from companies with which they have a business connection).

B) Use of university facilities (e.g. laboratories) for private gain (may be permitted by prior agreement and payment of use fee).

C) Restriction or prohibition in the influencing of the decision by the institution to employ a family member or individual with whom there is an economic interest.

D) Prohibition on use of confidential university information for outside interest.

There was a general feeling on the part of the interviewees that current policies and practices were more or less unsatisfactory coupled with concern that revised or additional policies could be restrictive and counter productive. One administrator commented ". . . the concept of the ideal professional has become so eroded that if something is not prohibited by policy then it is ok to do it" whereas another administrator stated ". . . the honor system is best, detailed policy will do more harm

than good. . ." A faculty member mentioned that there were some examples of faculty irresponsibility and more explicit records were necessary for public accountability but he doubted if policies could be developed which would be satisfactory to the legislature,which didn't distract from the academic enterprise. In summary, the real challenge seems to be development of more explicit poiicy and process for implementation, without creating a counter-productive bureaucracy.

APPENDIX

Institutions and Individuals Interviewed

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Dean Donner, Vice President Academic Affairs and Acting Dean, College of Liberal Arts.

Hubert Gibbs, Dean, Metropolitan College.

Paula Menyuk, Professor of Education (Psycholinguistics).

David Mostofsky, Professor of Psychology.

David Rice, Associate Dean, School of Law.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Frank Kidner, Special Consultant to the President, Professor (retired) of Economics (UC-Berkeley) and Vice President, University Relations (Retired), UC System.

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Cornelius Pings, Vice Provost and Dean, Graduate Studies.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Neal Ashby, Professor of Physics and Astrophysics, Chairman of Boulder Assembly Ad Hoc Committee on the One-Sixth Rule (Consulting).

James Corbridge, Professor of Law and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Rose Litman, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Grants and Contracts.

J. R. Nelson, Executive Vice President.

Theodore Volsky, Assistant Vice President for Faculty and Staff Affairs (University of Colorado System).

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Paul Civin, Professor of Mathematics and Educational Consultant to the President.

Paul Olum, Provost.

Glenn Starlin, Vice Provost.

Peter Von Hippel, Professor of Chemistry, Head, Institute of Biology, Chairman, Faculty Advisory Council.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Raymond Bacchetti, Vice Provost, Budget and Planning.

William Massy, Vice Provost for Research.

Norman Wessells, Professor of Biology and Chairman, Committee on Research.

Robert White, Professor and Vice-Chairman of Electrical Engineering, Director, Institute of Electronics and Medicine.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Merton Barstow, Director, Office of Research Contracts.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Robert Alberty, Dean of Science and Professor of Chemistry.

Carol Van Aken, Assistant Director, Sponsored Programs.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

David Ellis, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

O. T. Zimmerman, Professor of Chemical Engineering (Emeritus).

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Ellis Dill, Professor and Chairman, Aeronautics and Astronautics and Chairman, Council of Faculty Representatives (State-Wide).

Ronald Geballe, Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School.

Roy E. Nakatani, Professor and Assistant Director, Fisheries Research Institute, College of Fisheries.

Seymour Rabinovitch, Professor of Chemistry.

Irving Shain, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

"Ethical and Economic Issues: University Policies for Consulting, Overload Instructional Activities and Intellectual Property"
University of Southern California
Office of Institutional Studies
Los Angeles, California 90007
January 19-21, 1977

LIST OF AVAILABLE PAPERS

Earl G. L. Cilley, Director of Sponsored Projects at Stanford University	"Faculty Consulting: Issues in Academic Policy Development"
Donald F. Costello, Director of Academic Computing Services at the University of Nebraska Computing Network	"Computer Software in Education: Property Rights, Use, Royalties"
W. Todd Furniss, Director, Office of Academic Affairs for the American Council on Education	"Academic Compensation: Professoren, Pooh-Bahs, Parents, and Proles"
Hans J. Jenny, Vice President for Finance and Business and Professor of Economics at the College of Wooster	"Financial Health in Privately Controlled Institutions of Higher Education"
Norman Latker, Patent Counsel for the Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare	"University Patent Policies"
Louis Levin, Consultant and Member of the National General Medical Sciences Advisory Council	"Salary Reimbursement - Benefits and Costs"
Robert H. Linnell, Director, USC Office of Institutional Studies, and Herbert W. Marsh, Head, Evaluation Services, USC Office of Institutional Studies	"Ethical and Economic Issues: An Interview Survey at Ten Universities"
	"Ethical and Economic Issues: Policy Surveys"
Joseph B. Platt, President, Claremont University Center	"Accountability and Trust"
Virginia V. Rolett, Librarian, USC Office of Institutional Studies	"Selected Bibliography"
George Voegel, Dean, Learning Resources at William Rainey Harper College	"Ethical and Economic Issues: Intellectual Property, Who Owns It?"

(Individual papers are $2.00 each; a complete set of the papers is $15.00, postpaid. To order, send a note with a check or money order (payable to the University of Southern California) to Ellen Stewart, Conference Coordinator, Office of Institutional Studies/SSW 403, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90007.)